

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff-Intervenor,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION	)	
DISTRICT, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
MINERAL COUNTY,	)	
	)	
Proposed-Plaintiff-Intervenor	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
THE WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION	)	
DISTRICT, et al.,	)	
	)	
Proposed Defendants.	)	
	)	

In Equity No. C-125  
Sub-proceeding: C-125-C  
3:73-cv-00128-ECR-LRL

**O R D E R**

This case comes before the court on Mineral County's Report Concerning Status of Service on Proposed Defendants (#479). The court has considered the Report, Walker River Irrigation District's Response (#488), Mineral County's Reply (#496), and the comments of counsel during the status conference on October 19, 2010. For good cause shown,

IT IS ORDERED that the caption submitted as Exhibit C to Mineral County's Service Report (#479) is hereby approved as accurate and valid.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Mineral County's requests to dismiss parties as set forth in

1 its Service Report (#479) and in Exhibits 1 and 2 of Mineral County's Reply (#496) are hereby granted.

2 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the corrections to the captions reflected in Exhibit 3 of  
3 Mineral County's Reply (#496) are hereby approved.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Mineral County's requests to substitute parties as set forth  
5 in its Service Report (#479) and in Exhibits 1 and 4 of its Reply (#496) are hereby granted.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that service on other parties as requested in Mineral County's  
7 Service Report (#479) and Exhibit 5 of its Reply (#496) is hereby ratified.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties who remain to be served are those set forth in  
9 Exhibit 6 of Mineral County's Reply (#496); and that said parties shall be served without unnecessary  
10 delay.

11 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Mineral County shall not be required to make further service  
12 on parties who have already been validly served, and for whom the court has already ratified service.

13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that for the purposes of this litigation the estate and successors-in-  
14 interest of a deceased party bear the burden of filing and serving a Notice of Death pursuant to Fed. R.  
15 Civ. P. 25(a) in the event of a party's death.

16 DATED this 27th day of September, 2011.

17 

18  
19 **LAWRENCE R. LEAVITT**  
20 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26